

Turing, Kasparov and the future

Article

Published Version

Haworth, G. (2013) Turing, Kasparov and the future.
International Computer Games Association Journal, 36 (1). pp.
46-48. ISSN 1389-6911 Available at
<https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/32636/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

Publisher: The International Games Association

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading


Reading's research outputs online

TURING, KASPAROV AND THE FUTURE

G.M^cC. Haworth¹

Reading, UK

The ‘Turing 100’ conference (Manchester University, 2012) was held precisely 100 years after Alan Turing’s birth on the 23rd June 1912. It was the main event of the Turing Year organised by the Turing Centenary Advisory Committee, TCAC. Certainly the line-up was stellar, including (ACM, 2012) nine Turing Award winners (Fred Brooks, Vint Cerf, Edmund Clarke, Sir Tony Hoare, Don Knuth, Michael Rabin, Adi Shamir, Leslie Valiant, Andrew Chi-Chih Yao), not to mention amongst others David Ferrucci, Samuel Klein and Roger Penrose. The lectures are available on the web, have been frequently revisited and are strongly recommended.



Kasparov and the University of Manchester’s Alan Turing plaque (courtesy, Manchester Evening News)

Garry Kasparov was given the honour of unveiling the blue plaque commemorating Alan Turing, perhaps a pragmatic recognition that his name would be most familiar to the public. Kasparov’s (2012) popular talk was ostensibly to centre on the computer-based emulation of Turing’s second definition of a chess engine,² on a short game which he played against it, and on the Turing Test. In fact, his broader canvas considered the influence that computer chess had had on him, on the grass-roots game and on professional chess players. He also revealed, especially in the question session, his own perspective about chess and computers, past and future.

Kasparov noted that Goethe’s ‘Chess is the touchstone of the intellect’ certainly applied to Alan Turing who enjoyed playing the game, albeit with the advantage of heavy odds, against his much more capable colleagues at Bletchley Park.³ Turing’s results over the board no doubt led him to consider his own thought processes and their mechanisation. Kasparov thanked Alan Turing for his contributions to computer chess which not only formulated familiar chess engine concepts (forward search, quiescence, mobility, King safety and static position evaluation) but which also made chess central to early thinking about Artificial Intelligence, learning and the Turing Test (Copeland, 2004; Isenberg, 2013). He conjectured that, had Turing lived longer, progress in computer chess would have been even more rapid: one could mention other domains of computation such as theorem-proving.⁴

¹ The University of Reading, Berkshire, UK, RG6 6AH. email: guy.haworth@bnc.oxon.org.

² The talk was mistakenly trailed and thus in places misreported as being focused on the first ‘chess engine’, TUROCHAMP, as defined by Turing and Champernowne. Copeland (2004) clearly distinguishes between two paper engines.

³ Players included James Aitken, Hugh Alexander, Harry Golombek, Jack Good, Donald Michie and Stuart Milner-Barry.

⁴ An excellent theorem-proving competition was run within Turing 100 by Geoff Sutcliffe of the University of Miami.

It is clear that Turing changed the world for all of us but created specific opportunities and challenges for Kasparov personally, leading to computers reaching world championship standard just as he became the world champion. Recognising that computers had been both a blessing and a curse, Kasparov fondly recalled ‘the good old days of computer chess’ when in 1985 he could play 32 machines simultaneously and win 32-0.⁵ He mentioned that the computer, perhaps for the first time at world championship level, had helped find a novelty in 1995 - the rook-sac (17. Qg4) of the 10th game of his PCA match with Anand (Chessgames, 2013b), see Appendix 1.3. The computer contribution to the forthcoming Anand-Carlsen match will be interesting.

Ruefully, he recalled losing to IBM’s DEEP BLUE in their second match and not getting a deciding match. He suggested that the real question now is ‘On what basis would the best human players give the best computers a game when one slip might be enough to lose?’ In net terms however, Kasparov was positive about the contributions of computers to chess and society: he did not see computers as ‘the enemy’ and looked forward to man-and-machine rather than man-v-machine. He referred to his Advanced Chess match with Topalov (Friedel, 1998) as an attempt to combine human intuition and brute-force to create the perfect game of chess.

Anticipating the following panel on the Turing Test, Kasparov referred to the early role of chess in the formulation and use of the test, and to (Friedel, 2001):

- the insertion of Thompson’s BELLE into Pflieger’s 1980 simultaneous event, see Appendix 1.2,
- Kasparov’s identification of the BELLE game from five games of that simultaneous event, and
- the questioning of Allwermann’s play at the Böblinger Open in 1999.

Kasparov sees the covert involvement of computers in what should be ‘human chess’ as a major problem for today, the negative side of man-and-machine. On the other hand, it is clear that databases of games, chess engines, the real-time analysis of top-level games, web services and AGON’s recent tablet-based tournament interfacing application are all serving to raise playing standards and make chess more accessible, attractive and popular.

And so to the discussion of and game against the Chessbase 2004 ‘TURING’ reification⁶ of Turing’s second specification of a chess engine, unnamed but named ‘AT2’ here. AT2 searched two ply and performed static evaluation of leaf positions after following lines to quiescence. It ‘played’ one game, via Turing’s emulation, against Alick Glennie, see Appendix 1.1 which identifies ten apparent mistakes in Turing’s arithmetic.

This is the ‘Turing 100’ game with comments by Kasparov, and by Frederic Friedel who supported on the day:

TURING - Kasparov: **1. e3 Nf6 2. Nc3 d5 3. Nh3?** {GK: not the best move!} **e5 4. Qf3 Nc6 5. Bd3??** {FF post hoc: At two ply the engine cannot see the coming fork. At five ply, TURING plays 5. a4.} **5. ...e4 6. Bxe4 dxe4 7. Nxe4 Be7** {GH: waiting?} **8. Ng3 0-0** {GH: still waiting?} **9. 0-0 Bg4 10. Qf4 Bd6 11. Qc4 Bxh3 12. gxh3 Qd7 13. h4 Qh3 14. b3??** {FF: At five ply, TURING plays 14. f3 preventing the next move by Black.} **14. ... Ng4 15. Re1?** {FF: at five ply, TURING prevents immediate mate with 15. Qxg4} **15. ... Qxh2+ 16. Kf1 Qxf2# 0-1.**

Two questions arise. To what extent was Kasparov playing opponent-neutral, objectively-best chess and to what extent was he playing on TURING’s known weaknesses? How quickly can one, playing White or Black, beat a fallible TURING searching forward a nominal n -plies? Responses to the author are invited. The game sets the bar at 32 plies for ‘Black/2’. Chessbase (2012) reported that TURING had lasted 27 and 30 moves the previous evening when searching 5-ply but gave no profile of figures for other search-horizons.

Kasparov is to be congratulated for seeing computer chess in the broader context of Turing’s basic question ‘What can computers do?’ He sees WATSON as a greater achievement than DEEP BLUE, and like Picasso challenges us to ask the right questions for computers to answer. There are many more games and model-worlds to conquer.

References

ACM (2012). A.M. Turing Award winners. <http://amturing.acm.org/byyear.cfm>

Chessbase (2012). ‘Turing 100’/Kasparov report and discussion/download of Turing’s Engine. <http://www.chessbase.com/newsdetail.asp?newsid=8283>.

Chessgames (2013a). The 32 Kasparov-computer games of the Hamburg, 1985 simultaneous display.

⁵ Hamburg (Kasparov, 2010; Chessgames, 2013a): some games posed problems and/or lasted longer than 70 moves.

⁶ Created, extended, by Mathias Feist - assisted by Ken Thompson when TURING did not reproduce Turing’s own choices.

Chessgames (2013b). Kasparov-Anand, Game 10. <http://www.chessgames.com/perl/chessgame?gid=1018625>

Copeland, J. (2004). The Essential Turing, esp. Chapter 16, pp. 569-575.

Friedel, F. (1998). Advanced Chess by Kasparov and Topalov. ICCA Journal, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 126-130.

Friedel, F. (2001). Cheating in Chess. In: Advances in Computer Games 9, pp. 327-346. (ed. H. J. van den Herik and B. Monien). IKAT, Maastricht, The Netherlands.

Isenberg, G. (2013). Alan Turing: chess programmer. <http://chessprogramming.wikispaces.com/Alan+Turing>.

Kasparov, G. (2010). The Chess Master and the Computer: a review of *Chess Metaphors: Artificial Intelligence and the Human Mind* by D. Rasskin-Gutman. New York Review of Books, Feb. 11th.

Kasparov, G. (2012). Alan Turing's Paper Machine. The Turing 100 Conference, Manchester. http://videlectures.net/turing100_kasparov_friedel_paper_machine/.

Manchester University (2012). Turing 100: The Alan Turing Centenary Conference, June 22-25, 2012. <http://www.turing100.manchester.ac.uk/>.

Appendix 1: the cited games

A1.1 Turing as engine 'AT2' v Glennie (1951)

The TURING rendition by Chessbase of 'AT2', Turing's second definition of a chess engine, varies from Turing's choices ten times – on moves 1, 4, 5, 15, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23 and 26.

(ECO C26) **1. e4** {TURING 1. e3. Kasparov referred to 'e4' as possibly the first case of human interference in a computer's play} **1... e5** **2. Nc3** **Nf6** **3. d4** **Bb4** **4. Nf3?** {TURING 4. dxe5} **4... d6** **5. Bd2** {TURING 5. Bg5} **5... Nc6** **6. d5** **Nd4** **7. h4** **Bg4** **8. a4** **Nxf3+** **9. gxf3** **Bh5** **10. Bb5+** **c6** **11. dxc6** **O-O** **12. cxb7** **Rb8** **13. Ba6** **Qa5** **14. Qe2** **Nd7** **15. Rg1** {TURING 15. Rh3} **15... Nc5** **16. Rg5** **Bg6** **17. Bb5** {TURING 17. h5} **17... Nxb7** **18. O-O-O** **Nc5** **19. Bc6** {TURING 19. Be3} **19... Rfc8** **20. Bd5** {TURING 20. Bb5} **20... Bxc3** **21. Bxc3** **Qxa4** **22. Kd2** {TURING 22. Qe3} **22... Ne6** **23. Rg4** {TURING 23. Bb3} **23... Nd4** **24. Qd3** **Nb5** **25. Bb3** **Qa6** **26. Bc4** {TURING 26. Rg5} **26... Bh5** **27. Rg3** **Qa4** **28. Bxb5** **Qxb5** **29. Qxd6** **Rd8** **30. Rxb7** **0-1**.

A1.2 Pflieger v BELLE (1980)

Pflieger was only asked afterwards if he noticed anything about this game, which he did not. Similarly, Kasparov was asked later by Friedel to identify the one participating computer from five of Pflieger's games. Thus, neither of these 'tests' was strictly a chessic Turing test. Kasparov correctly and instantly identified Black here as the computer, not because of excellence on its part but because the human players made simple errors which a computer of the time would not make. Note that Pflieger still had a win at move 58 and a draw at move 62.

(ECO D10) **1. d4** **d5** **2. c4** **c6** **3. cxd5** **cx d5** **4. Nc3** **Nc6** **5. Nf3** **Nf6** **6. Bf4** **Bf5** **7. e3** **e6** **8. Bb5** **Nd7** **9. 0-0** **Be7** **10. Qe2** **Re8** **11. Rac1** **Bg4** **12. h3** **Bh5** **13. g4** **Bg6** **14. Ne5** **Ndx5** **15. Bxe5** **O-O** **16. Bg3** **f5** **17. Bd3** **Bd6** **18. f4** **Bb4** **19. g5** **Qe8** **20. a3** **Bh5** **21. Qd2** **Ba5** **22. b4** **Bb6** **23. Kh2** **Rf7** **24. Nb5** **Rd7** **25. a4** **a5** **26. bxa5** **Bxa5** **27. Qb2** **Bb4** **28. Be1** **Bxe1** **29. Rfxe1** **Qd8** **30. Qa3** **Bf3** **31. Kg3** **Bh5** **32. Rc2** **Qa5** **33. Rec1** **Ra8** **34. Nd6** **Qxa4** **35. Qxa4** **Rxa4** **36. Nxb7** **Rxb7** **37. Rxc6** **Ra3** **38. R1c3** **Rxc3** **39. Rxc3** **h6** **40. h4** **Kf8** **41. Ba6** **Rb6** **42. Bf1** **hgx5** **43. fxg5** **g6** **44. Kf4** **Ke7** **45. Ke5** **Bf3** **46. Rc7+** **Kd8** **47. Rg7** **Bh5** **48. Ra7** **Bf3** **49. Ba6** **Bg2** {Ken Thompson was ready to resign for BELLE: 50. h5 is crushing} **50. Ra8+**? **50... Kc7** **51. Bc8?** {h5 still wins here or on the next move} **Rb3** **52. Kf4?**= **e5+** **53. Kxe5** **Rxe3+** **54. Kf6** **f4** **55. Be6** **Kb6** **56. h5** **gxh5** **57. g6** **f3??** (57. ... Rg3 58. g7 f3 59. Bxd5 f2 60. Bxg2 Rxg2=) **58. Bxd5?** (58. g7! wins f2 59. g8=Q f1Q+ 60. Bf5 Qf4 61. Qd8+ Qc7 62. Rb8+ Kc6 63. Rc8) **Bh1** **59. Ra1** **f2** **60. Rb1+** **Kc7** **61. Bxh1** **Re1** **62. Bg2??** (62. Rb7+ =) **Rxb1** **63. g7** **Rg1?** (63. ... f1=Q+ wins more clearly) **64. g8=Q** {BELLE sees h1=Q ahead} **f1=Q** **65. Bxf1** **Rxg8** **66. Bh3** **Kd6** **67. d5** **h4** **68. Be6** **Rg3** **0-1**.

A1.3 Kasparov v Anand: game 10 (1995)

This is Kasparov's early example of a line prepared with computer help (Chessgames, 2013b):

(ECO C80) **1.e4** **e5** **2.Nf3** **Nc6** **3.Bb5** **a6** **4.Ba4** **Nf6** **5.O-O** **Nxe4** **6.d4** **b5** **7.Bb3** **d5** **8.dxe5** **Be6** **9.Nbd2** **Nc5** **10.c3** **d4** **11.Ng5** **dx c3** **12.Nxe6** **fxe6** **13.bxc3** **Qd3** **14.Bc2** **Qxc3** **15.Nb3** **Nxb3** **16.Bxb3** **Nd4**⁷ **17.Qg4!** {'deep' in some computer searches} **Qxa1** **18.Bxe6** **Rd8** **19.Bh6** **Qc3** **20.Bxg7** {all played by White in 6 minutes} **Qd3** **21.Bxh8** **Qg6** **22.Bf6** **Be7** **23.Bxe7** **Qxg4** **24.Bxg4** **Kxe7** **25.Rc1** **c6** **26.f4** **a5** **27.Kf2** **a4** **28.Ke3** **b4** **29.Bd1** **a3** **30.g4** **Rd5** **31.Rc4** **c5** **32.Ke4** **Rd8** **33.Rxc5** **Ne6** **34.Rd5** **Rc8** **35.f5** **Rc4+** **36.Ke3** **Nc5** **37.g5** **Rc1** **38.Rd6** **1-0**.

⁷ Position 17w is r3kb1r/2p3pp/p3p3/1p2P3/3n4/1Bq5/P4PPP/R1BQ1RK1 w kq - 0 17.